

The first change is that the accessibility of airports, especially once
> > you
> > go past security, will fall under the ACAA instead of the ADA. The ACAA
> > contains no building requirements like the ADA Accessibility Guidelines
so
> > we would not be able to insist that airport terminals and gates meet the
> > access requirements of the ADA. Since there is no right to sue under the
> > ACAA, unlike the ADA, all we could do if faced with barriers at airport
> > gates is complain to the DOT - an agency with a long history of ignoring
> > complaints against airlines. We will continue to be forced to use jetway
> > ramps with no handrails and with slopes far exceeding the ADAAG maximum
> > allowed slope.
> >
> > Airlines will be able to continue eliminating bulkhead seats that are
> > currently required for people with legs that do not bend and people with
> > service animals. Most people with service dogs will no longer be able to
> > travel by air as the new rules require a service animal to in the space
> > under the seat in front of the passenger assisted by the service dog.
Can
> > you imagine trying to get a guide dog for a person who is blind or a
> > service
> > dog that pulls a person in a wheelchair into a space that is 16 inches
> > wide
> > and less than 12 inches high? People with legs that cannot bend, due to
> > joint fusions or braces, will be left to stick their leg out in the main
> > aisle. If one has two legs that do not bend then that person will simply
> > be
> > out of luck. Where the person with a leg in the aisle is supposed to put
> > that leg during take off and landing, when the aisle must be clear, or
> > when
> > the food and beverage cart needs to get by is an issue ignored by the
DOT.
> >
> > New aircraft will be able to continue being built with no accessible
> > restroom other than in aircraft with two or more main aisles. Airlines
are
> > buying many new aircraft but few have more than one aisle. New very
large
> > aircraft are being designed, most with a single aisle. Instead of the
> > regulatory law increasing the accessible restroom requirement, 17 years
> > after the ACAA became law, this requirement is not being increased from
> > the
> > original law.
> >
> > People who are obese due to their disabilities will be required to pay
for
> > two seats if not able to fit into the very narrow seats provided in
coach
> > class in all commercial aircraft. The width of a coach seat has shrunk
to
> > only 16 inches. The width of a standard wheelchair seat is 18 inches by
> > contrast. The DOT claims that because airlines make money by selling
seats
> > they should not be required to give more space to people with
disabilities
> > unless we pay for more space. This ignores the fact that stadiums,
arenas,

> > movie theaters, etc., make money by selling seats but the ADA requires
> > wider
> > seating spaces for people with disabilities. A stadium with 20 inch wide
> > seats is required to provide a 33 inch wide space for a person using a
> > wheelchair. A restaurant can put two chairs on the 48 inch side of a
table
> > must must provide a 30 inch width to a person using a wheelchair. I
guess
> > the DOT feels that though every other business in America is required to
> > accommodate people with disabilities airlines should be allowed to
charge
> > us
> > double if we can't fit into a 16 inch wide seat. That is also their
> > solution
> > to a service dog that cannot fit under a seat, make the passenger with a
> > disability purchase two seats.
> >
> > The proposed new regulatory law continues to allow discrimination
against
> > people with disabilities who need to use oxygen in flight. One of the
big
> > holes in the current ACAA is that airlines may provide in flight oxygen
> > but
> > are not required to do so. Southwest Airlines, for example, refuses to
> > provide oxygen on any of their flights forcing people who need oxygen to
> > pay
> > much higher airfares to other airlines. The proposed new regulatory law,
> > that should have fixed this so that airlines are required to provide in
> > flight medical oxygen continues to allow airlines to simply decided to
not
> > provide this necessary service.
> >
> > There are many other things wrong with this proposed regulatory law; my
> > comments are that you view these changes from the eyes of someone trying to
function with a disability under these proposed conditions, and how would you feel?
I can only hope that none of you in charge of the proposed changes, ever
experience a health condition or accident where you find your selves on the
other side of the aisle. And if that is not possible, then look at it from a good
business PR prospective to provide quality customer service.